

THE STATES OF DELIBERATION
of the
ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

18th March, 2020

Proposition No. P.2020/23

Development & Planning Authority

The Island Development Plan-Five Year Review of the Island Development Plan

AMENDMENT

Proposed by: Deputy J.S. Merrett
Seconded by: Deputy R.H. Graham

After Proposition 2 add the following proposition -

- "2A. To direct the Development & Planning Authority, in consultation with all relevant Committees and stakeholders, to extend the current scope of the Five Year Review of the IDP to include a review of policies affecting Areas of Biodiversity Importance (ABIs), including policy GP3, giving particular consideration to strengthening the protection given to the biodiversity interest of such areas so that development on ABIs, in particular building operations, is only allowed where:
- (a) the biodiversity interest of the area is maintained or enhanced; or
 - (b) any negative impacts of the development are appropriately and proportionately mitigated."

Rule 4(3) Information

The Director of Planning has advised that the above is capable of consideration as part of the 5-Year Review without the requirement for additional resources.

Explanatory note

There appears to be a general misunderstanding about the purpose of policy GP3 (ABIs.)

Some of those who voted for the Island Development Plan may be disappointed at some of the policy interpretations and implementations of the policies that were agreed. This includes GP3.

It was believed that ABIs would have enhanced protection from development compared to other non-designated sites.

Further, that GP3 could be a policy mechanism that could primarily give a presumption of protection of biodiversity in designated sites. In simple terms, it was believed that areas that have an ABI status, would have more protection from development proposals than areas that do not have an ABI status.

This amendment provides for a review of the policies affecting ABIs and a consideration of the strengthening of protection. This protection is not specifically included under Proposition 1, which only covers a re-survey of the current ABI sites, including whether they meet the SSS (Sites of Special Significance) criteria.

However, the proposer and seconder do not believe that the existing policy, in its interpretation or implementation, offer adequate protection, or even an adequate presumption of protection.

Currently GP3 states that:

Development within an ABI will be supported provided that:

- a. Proposals demonstrate that the biodiversity interest of the site has been considered and taken into account as part of the design and development process; and,
- b. The biodiversity interest of the area has been protected and, where possible, enhanced; or
- c. Any negative impacts can be appropriately and proportionality mitigated in accordance with a scheme to be approved by the Authority.

But this has meant that, in reality, ABIs have literally been stripped back to bare soil (see figures 1 and 2) with the argument being that the planting of native flora is adequate mitigation. It is the opinion of the proposer and seconder and members of

our community, that there is inadequate protection for existing biodiversity and that the DPA should consider enhancing the protection.



Figure 1 ABI before



Figure 2 ABI after clearance